

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 has been amended. Amendments to claim 1 are supported by at least the description at page 8, lines 17-22 and the description at page 10, lines 5-10 of the present specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Youn et al. (U.S. 6,144,149) in view of Jeong et al. (U.S. 5,298,832). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Youn discloses in Figure 5 a mask frame 120 with a plurality of holes 121a that are formed on the flange portion 120b. The flange portion 120b acts as an electron shield. The holes 121a may compensate for a magnetic influence, which would result in a smaller anhysteretic magnetic permeability in that portion of the mask frame that includes the holes 121a. However, Youn fails to disclose or suggest that “at least a part of the electron shield is formed of a material having a smaller anhysteretic magnetic permeability than the shadow mask, the mask frame, and the inner magnetic field,” as required by claim 1. Youn discloses alteration in the structure of the flange portion 120b of the mask frame 120 by adding a plurality of holes 121 in order to affect the magnetic permeability of the flange portion 120b, but fails to disclose or suggest the use of a specific material to affect magnetic permeability.

Jeong also fails to disclose or suggest altering anhysteretic magnetic permeability of an electron shield of a color cathode ray using materials. Specifically, Jeong fails to disclose that “at least a part of the electron shield is formed of a material having a smaller anhysteretic magnetic permeability than another part of the electron shield,” as required by claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that neither Youn, Jeong, nor a combination of these references disclose or suggest every limitation of claims 1 and 2. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Further to the above, a color cathode ray tube having the electron shield features required by claim 1 provides certain advantages not disclosed or suggested by the Youn and Jeong references. According to the configuration of claim 1, a part of the electron shield is formed of a material having a smaller anhysteretic magnetic permeability, thus making it possible to raise the magnetic resistance between the electron shield and the shadow mask. As a result, the magnetic field leakage out from the front end of the electron shield can be reduced so that mis-landing due

to a terrestrial magnetism can be reduced. In addition, the magnetic permeability of part of the electron shield is determined using a certain material, an original function of the electron shield, which is to shield against an over-scanning electron beam, is not impaired. In contrast, an electron shield having a plurality of holes, as disclosed by Youn, results in impairment of the electron shield being able to shield against an over-scanning electron beam. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable for these additional reasons.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Youn in view of Jeong and further in view of Kokubu et al. (U.S. 4,931,690). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.


As discussed above, Youn and Jeong fail to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 1. Kokubu fails to remedy the deficiencies of Youn and Jeong as they relate to claim 1. Therefore, claim 3 is allowable for at least the reason it is dependent upon an allowable base claim. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of this rejection.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: October 3, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM/JNR:ae